arXiv:1702.05036v1 [q-fin.MF] 16 Feb 2017

Uncertain Volatility Models with Stochastic Bounds*

Jean-Pierre Fouque † and Ning Ning †

Abstract. In this paper, we propose the uncertain volatility models with stochastic bounds. Like the regular uncertain volatility models, we know only that the true model lies in a family of progressively measurable and bounded processes, but instead of using two deterministic bounds, the uncertain volatility fluctuates between two stochastic bounds generated by its inherent stochastic volatility process. This brings better accuracy and is consistent with the observed volatility path such as for the VIX as a proxy for instance. We apply the regular perturbation analysis upon the worst case scenario price, and derive the first order approximation in the regime of slowly varying stochastic bounds. The original problem which involves solving a fully nonlinear PDE in dimension two for the worst case scenario price, is reduced to solving a nonlinear PDE in dimension one and a linear PDE with source, which gives a tremendous computational advantage. Numerical experiments show that this approximation procedure performs very well, even in the regime of moderately slow varying stochastic bounds.

Key words. uncertain volatility, stochastic bounds, nonlinear Black–Scholes–Barenblatt PDE, approximation

AMS subject classifications. 60H10, 91G80, 35Q93

1. Introduction.

In the standard Black–Scholes model of option pricing [3], volatility is assumed to be known and constant over time, which seems unrealistic. Extensions of the Black–Scholes model to model ambiguity have been proposed, such as the stochastic volatility approach [10, 11], the jump diffusion model [1, 17], and the uncertain volatility model [2, 16]. Among these extensions, the uncertain volatility model has received intensive attention in Mathematical Finance for risk management purpose.

In the uncertain volatility models (UVMs), volatility is not known precisely and assumed between constant upper and lower bounds $\underline{\sigma}$ and $\overline{\sigma}$. These bounds could be inferred from extreme values of the implied volatilities of the liquid options, or from high-low peaks in historical stock- or option-implied volatilities.

Under the risk-neutral measure, the price process of the risky asset satisfies the following stochastic differential equation (SDE):

$$dX_t = rX_t dt + \alpha_t X_t dW_t, \tag{1}$$

where r is the constant risk-free rate, (W_t) is a Brownian motion and the volatility process (α_t) belongs to a family $\mathcal{A}$ of progressively measurable and $[\underline{\sigma}, \overline{\sigma}]$-valued processes.

When pricing a European derivative written on the risky asset with maturity T and nonnegative payoff $h(X_T)$, the seller of the contract is interested in the worst-case scenario. By assuming the worst case, sellers are guaranteed coverage against adverse market behavior if the realized volatility belongs to the candidate set. It is known that the worst-case scenario

*Submitted February 15, 2017.

Funding: Research supported by NSF grant DMS-1409434.

†Department of Statistics & Applied Probability, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106-3110 (fouque@pstat.ucsb.edu, ning@pstat.ucsb.edu).

This manuscript is for review purposes only.

price at time $t < T$ is given by

$$P(t, X_t) := \exp(-r(T-t))\,\mathrm{ess\,sup}_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}}\,\mathbb{E}_t[h(X_T)], \tag{2}$$

where $\mathbb{E}_t[\cdot]$ is the conditional expectation given $\mathcal{F}_t$ with respect to the risk neutral measure.

Following the arguments in stochastic control theory, $P(t, X_t)$ is the viscosity solution to the following Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation, which is the generalized Black–Scholes–Barenblatt (BSB) nonlinear equation in Financial Mathematics,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t P + r(x\partial_x P - P) + \sup_{\alpha\in[\underline{\sigma},\overline{\sigma}]}\left[\frac{1}{2}x^2\alpha^2\partial^2_{xx}P\right] = 0, \\ P(T, x) = h(x). \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

It is well known that the worst case scenario price is equal to its Black–Scholes price with constant volatility $\overline{\sigma}$ (resp. $\underline{\sigma}$) for convex (resp. concave) payoff function (see [19] for instance). For general terminal payoff functions, an asymptotic analysis of the worst case scenario option prices as the volatility interval degenerates to a single point is given in [6].

In fact, for contingent claims with longer maturities, it is no longer consistent with observed volatility to assume that the bounds are constant (for instance by looking at the VIX over years, which is a popular measure of the implied volatility of S&P 500 index options). Therefore, instead of modeling α_t fluctuating between two deterministic bounds,

$$\underline{\sigma} \le \alpha_t \le \overline{\sigma}, \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \le t \le T,$$

we consider the case that the uncertain volatility moves between two stochastic bounds,

$$\underline{\sigma}_t := d\sqrt{Z_t} \le \alpha_t \le \overline{\sigma}_t := u\sqrt{Z_t}, \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \le t \le T,$$

where u and d are two constants such that $0 < d < 1 < u$, and Z_t can be any other positive stochastic process.

In this paper, we consider the general three-parameter CIR process with evolution

$$dZ_t = \delta\kappa(\theta - Z_t)dt + \sqrt{\delta}\sqrt{Z_t}dW^Z_t. \tag{4}$$

Here, κ and θ are strictly positive parameters with the Feller condition $\theta\kappa \ge \frac{1}{2}$ satisfied to ensure that Z_t stays positive, δ is a small positive parameter that characterizes the slow variation of the process Z_t, and (W^Z_t) is a Brownian motion possibly correlated to (W_t) driving the stock price, with $d\langle W, W^Z\rangle_t = \rho dt$ for $|\rho| < 1$. One realization of these processes is shown in Figure 1 with $\delta = .05$. Denoting $\alpha_t := q_t\sqrt{Z_t}$, then the uncertainty in the volatility can be absorbed in the uncertain adapted slope

$$d \le q_t \le u, \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \le t \le T.$$

In order to study the asymptotic behavior, we emphasize the importance of δ and reparameterize the SDE of the risky asset price process as

$$dX^\delta_t = rX^\delta_t dt + q_t\sqrt{Z_t}X^\delta_t dW_t. \tag{5}$$



Figure 1. *Simulated stochastic bounds* $[0.75\sqrt{Z_t}, 1.25\sqrt{Z_t}]$ *where* Z_t *is the (slow) mean-reverting CIR process* (4).

When $\delta = 0$, note that the CIR process Z_t is frozen at z, and then the risky asset price process follows the dynamic

$$dX_t^0 = rX_t^0 dt + q_t\sqrt{z}X_t^0 dW_t. \tag{6}$$

Both X_t^δ and X_t^0 start at the same point x.

Suppose that $\mathcal{X}$ is a European derivative written on the risky asset with maturity T and payoff $h(X_T)$. We denote its smallest riskless selling price (worst case scenario) at time $t < T$ as

$$P^\delta(t,x,z) := \exp(-r(T-t))\,\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{q_\cdot\in[d,u]} \mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}[h(X_T^\delta)], \tag{7}$$

where $\mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}[\cdot]$ is the conditional expectation given $\mathcal{F}_t$ with $X_t^\delta = x$ and $Z_t = z$. When $\delta = 0$, we represent the smallest riskless selling price as

$$P_0(t,x,z) = \exp(-r(T-t))\,\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{q_\cdot\in[d,u]} \mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}[h(X_T^0)], \tag{8}$$

where the subscripts in $\mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}[\cdot]$ also means that $X_t^0 = x$ and $Z_t = z$ given the same filtration $\mathcal{F}_t$. Notice that $P_0(t,X_t,z)$ corresponds to $P(t,X_t)$ in (2) with constant volatility bounds given by $d\sqrt{z}$ and $u\sqrt{z}$.

The rest of the paper proceeds as follows. In Section 2, we first explain the convergence of the worst case scenario price P^δ and its second derivative $\partial_{xx}^2 P^\delta$ as δ goes to 0. We then write down the pricing nonlinear parabolic PDE (10) which characterizes the option price

$P^\delta(t,x,z)$ as a function of the present time t, the value x of the underlying asset, and the levels z of the volatility driving process. At last, we introduce the main result that the first order approximation to P^δ is $P_0+\sqrt{\delta}P_1$ with accuracy in the order of $\mathcal{O}(\delta)$, where we define P_0 and P_1 in (12) and (17) respectively. The proof of the main result is presented in Section 3. In Section 4, a numerical illustration is presented. We conclude in Section 5. Some technical proofs are given in the Appendices.

2. Main Result.

In this section, we first prove the Lipschitz continuity of the worst case scenario price P^δ with respect to the parameter δ. Then, we derive the main BSB equation that the worst case scenario price should follow and further identify the first order approximation when δ is small enough. We reduce the original problem of solving the fully nonlinear PDE (10) in dimension two to solving the nonlinear PDE (12) in dimension one and a linear PDE (17) with source. The accuracy of this approximation is given in Theorem 2.11, the main theorem of this paper.

2.1. Convergence of P^δ.

It is established in Appendix A that X_t and Z_t have finite moments uniformly in δ, which leads to the following result:

Proposition 2.1. *Let X^δ satisfies the SDE (5) and X^0 satisfies the SDE (6), then, uniformly in (q.),*

$$\mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}(X_T^\delta - X_T^0)^2 \le C_0\delta$$

where C_0 is a positive constant independent of δ.

Proof. See Appendix B. ∎

Assumption 2.2. *We impose more regularity conditions on the terminal function h, i.e., Lipschitz continuity, differentiability up to the fourth order and polynomial growth conditions on the first four derivatives of h:*

$$\begin{cases} |h'(x)| \le K_1, \\ |h''(x)| \le K_2(1+|x|^m), \\ |h'''(x)| \le K_3(1+|x|^n), \\ |h^{(4)}(x)| \le K_4(1+|x|^l), \\ |h(x)-h(y)| \le K_0|x-y|. \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

where K_i for $i \in \{0,1,2,3,4\}$, m, n and l are positive constants.

Theorem 2.3. *Under Assumption 2.2, $P^\delta(t,\cdot,\cdot)$ as a family of functions of x and z indexed by δ, uniformly converge to $P_0(t,\cdot,\cdot)$ in (q.) with rate $\sqrt{\delta}$, for all $(t,x,z) \in [0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^+\times\mathbb{R}^+$.*

Proof. For P^δ given by (7) and P_0 given by (8), using the Lipschitz continuous of $h(\cdot)$ and

by the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}|P^\delta - P_0| =& \exp(-r(T-t))|\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{q.\in[d,u]} \mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}[h(X_T^\delta)] - \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{q.\in[d,u]} \mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}[h(X_T^0)]| \\ \leq& \exp(-r(T-t))|\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{q.\in[d,u]} \mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}[h(X_T^\delta)] - \mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}[h(X_T^0)]| \\ \leq& \exp(-r(T-t))\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{q.\in[d,u]} |\mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}[h(X_T^\delta) - h(X_T^0)]| \\ \leq& K_0 \exp(-r(T-t))\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{q.\in[d,u]} \mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}|X_T^\delta - X_T^0| \\ \leq& K_0 \exp(-r(T-t))\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{q.\in[d,u]} [\mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}(X_T^\delta - X_T^0)^2]^{1/2}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by Proposition 2.1, we have

$$|P^\delta - P_0| \leq C_1\sqrt{\delta}$$

where C_1 is a positive constant independent of δ, as desired. ∎

2.2. Pricing Nonlinear PDEs. We now derive P_0 and P_1, the leading order term and the first correction for the approximation of the worst-case scenario price P^δ, which is the solution to the HJB equation associated to the corresponding control problem given by the generalized BSB nonlinear equation:

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t P^\delta + r(x\partial_x P^\delta - P^\delta) + \sup_{q\in[d,u]} \{\frac{1}{2}q^2 z x^2 \partial_{xx}^2 P^\delta + \sqrt{\delta}(q\rho z x \partial_{xz}^2 P^\delta)\} \\ +\delta(\frac{1}{2}z\partial_{zz}^2 P^\delta + \kappa(\theta - z)\partial_z P^\delta) = 0,\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

with terminal condition $P^\delta(T,x,z) = h(x)$. For simplicity and without loss of generality, $r = 0$ is assumed for the rest of paper.

In this section, we use the regular perturbation approach to formally expand the value function $P^\delta(t,x,z)$ as follows:

$$P^\delta = P_0 + \sqrt{\delta}P_1 + \delta P_2 + \cdots. \tag{11}$$

Inserting this expansion into the main BSB equation (10), by Theorem 2.3, the leading order term P_0 is the solution to

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t P_0 + \sup_{q\in[d,u]} \{\frac{1}{2}q^2 z x^2 \partial_{xx}^2 P_0\} = 0, \\ P_0(T,x,z) = h(x).\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

In this case, z is just a positive parameter, we can achieve the existence and uniqueness of a smooth solution to (12), which is referred in the classical work of [7] and [19].

2.2.1. Convergence of $\partial_{xx}^2 P^\delta$. The main references on the regularity for uniformly parabolic equations are [4], [21] and [22]. In order to use these results, we have to make a log transformation to change variable x to $\ln x$. Then because q_t is bounded away from 0 in $\mathcal{A}$, (10) is uniformly parabolic. Note that given h, which satisfies Assumption 2.2, it is known that P_0 belongs to $C_p^{1,2}$ (p for polynomial growth). We conjecture that the result can be extended to P^δ for δ fixed. Since a full proof is beyond the scope of this paper, here we just assume this property.

Assumption 2.4. *Throughout the paper, we make the following assumptions on* $P^\delta(t,\cdot,\cdot)$*:*
(i) $P^\delta(t,\cdot,\cdot)$ *belongs to* $C_p^{1,2,2}$ *(p for polynomial growth), for* δ *fixed.*
(ii) $\partial_x P^\delta(t,\cdot,\cdot)$ *and* $\partial^2_{xx}P^\delta(t,\cdot,\cdot)$ *are uniformly bounded in* δ*.*

Then under this assumption, we have the following Proposition:

Proposition 2.5. *Under Assumptions 2.2 and 2.4, the family* $\partial^2_{xx}P^\delta(t,\cdot,\cdot)$ *of functions of* x *and* z *indexed by* δ*, converges to* $\partial^2_{xx}P_0(t,\cdot,\cdot)$ *as* δ *tends to* 0 *with rate* $\sqrt{\delta}$*, uniformly on compact sets in* x *and* z*, for* $t\in[0,T)$*.*

Proof. Under Assumptions 2.2 and 2.4, and by Theorem 2.3, the Proposition can be obtained by following the arguments in Theorem 5.2.5 of [8]. ∎

Denote the zero sets of $\partial^2_{xx}P_0$ as

$$S^0_{t,z} := \{x = x(t,z)\in\mathbb{R}^+ | \partial^2_{xx}P_0(t,x,z)=0\}.$$

Define the set where $\partial^2_{xx}P^\delta$ and $\partial^2_{xx}P_0$ take different signs as

$$\begin{aligned} A^\delta_{t,z} :=& \{x=x(t,z)|\partial^2_{xx}P^\delta(t,x,z)>0, \partial^2_{xx}P_0(t,x,z)<0\} \\ &\cup\{x=x(t,z)|\partial^2_{xx}P^\delta(t,x,z)<0, \partial^2_{xx}P_0(t,x,z)>0\}. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Assumption 2.6. *We make the following assumptions:*
(i) There is a finite number of zero points of $\partial^2_{xx}P_0$*, for any* $t\in[0,T]$*. That is,* $S^0_{t,z}=\{x_1<x_2<\cdots<x_{m(t)}\}$ *and* $\max_{0\le t\le T} m(t)\le n$*.*
(ii) There exists a constant C *such that the set* $A^\delta_{t,z}$ *defined in (13) is included in* $\cup_{i=1}^n I_i^\delta$*, where*

$$I_i^\delta := [x_i - C\sqrt{\delta}, x_i + C\sqrt{\delta}], \quad \text{for } x_i\in S^0_{t,z} \text{ and } 1\le i\le m(t).$$

Remark 2.7. *Here we explain the rationale for Assumption 2.6 (ii).*

Suppose P_0 *has a third derivative with respect to* x*, which does not vanish on the set* $S^0_{t,z}$*. By Proposition 2.5,* $\partial^2_{xx}P^\delta(t,\cdot,\cdot)$ *converges to* $\partial^2_{xx}P_0(t,\cdot,\cdot)$ *with rate* $\sqrt{\delta}$*, therefore we conclude that there exists a constant* C *such that on* $(\cup_{i=1}^n I_i^\delta)^c$*,* $\partial^2_{xx}P^\delta(t,\cdot,\cdot)$ *and* $\partial^2_{xx}P_0(t,\cdot,\cdot)$ *have the same sign, and Assumption 2.6 (ii) would follow. This is illustrated in Figure 7 with an example with two zero points for* $\partial^2_{xx}P_0(t,\cdot,\cdot)$*.*

Otherwise, I_i^δ *would have a larger radius of order* $\mathcal{O}(\delta^\alpha)$ *for* $\alpha\in(0,\frac{1}{2})$*, and then the accuracy in the Main Theorem 2.11 would be* $\mathcal{O}(\delta^{\alpha+1/2})$*, but in any case of order* $o(\sqrt{\delta})$*.*

2.2.2. Optimizers. The optimal control in the nonlinear PDE (12) for P_0, denoted as

$$q^{*,0}(t,x,z) := \arg\max_{q\in[d,u]}\{\frac{1}{2}q^2 z x^2 \partial^2_{xx}P_0\},$$

is given by

$$q^{*,0}(t,x,z) = \begin{cases} u, \partial^2_{xx}P_0\ge 0 \\ d, \partial^2_{xx}P_0<0 \end{cases}. \tag{14}$$

The optimizer to the main BSB equation (10) is given in the following lemma:

Lemma 2.8. *Under Assumption 2.6, for δ sufficiently small and for $x \notin S^0_{t,z}$, the optimal control in the nonlinear PDE (10) for P^δ, denoted as*

$$q^{*,\delta}(t,x,z) := \arg\max_{q\in[d,u]}\{\frac{1}{2}q^2zx^2\partial^2_{xx}P^\delta + \sqrt{\delta}(q\rho zx\partial^2_{xz}P^\delta)\},$$

is given by

$$q^{*,\delta}(t,x,z) = \begin{cases} u, \partial^2_{xx}P^\delta \geq 0 \\ d, \partial^2_{xx}P^\delta < 0 \end{cases}. \tag{15}$$

Proof. To find the optimizer $q^{*,\delta}$ to

$$\sup_{q\in[d,u]}\{\frac{1}{2}q^2zx^2\partial^2_{xx}P^\delta + \sqrt{\delta}(q\rho zx\partial^2_{xz}P^\delta)\},$$

we firstly relax the restriction $q \in [d,u]$ to $q \in \mathbb{R}$.

Denote

$$f(q) := \frac{1}{2}q^2zx^2\partial^2_{xx}P^\delta + \sqrt{\delta}(q\rho zx\partial^2_{xz}P^\delta).$$

By the result of Proposition 2.5 that $\partial^2_{xx}P^\delta$ uniformly converge to $\partial^2_{xx}P_0$ as δ goes to 0, for $x \notin S^0_{t,z}$, the optimizer of $f(q)$ is given by

$$\hat{q}^{*,\delta} = -\frac{\rho\sqrt{\delta}\partial^2_{xz}P^\delta}{x\partial^2_{xx}P^\delta}.$$

Since X_t and Z_t are strictly positive, the sign of the coefficient of q^2 in $f(q)$ is determined by the sign of $\partial^2_{xx}P^\delta$. We have the following cases represented in Figure 2, from which we can see that for δ sufficiently small such that $|\hat{q}^{*,\delta}| \leq d$, the optimizer is given by

$$q^{*,\delta} = u\mathbb{1}_{\{\partial^2_{xx}P^\delta\geq 0\}} + d\mathbb{1}_{\{\partial^2_{xx}P^\delta<0\}}.$$

Remark 2.9. *When $h(\cdot)$ is convex (resp. concave), since supremum and expectation preserves convexity (resp. concavity), one can see that the worst case scenario price*

$$P^\delta(t,x,z) = \exp(-r(T-t))\,\mathrm{ess\,sup}_{q.\in[d,u]}\,\mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}[h(X_T)],$$

is convex (resp. concave) with $\partial^2_{xx}P^\delta > 0$ (resp. < 0), and thus $q^{*,\delta} = u$ (resp. $= d$). In these two cases, we are back to perturbations around Black–Scholes prices which have been treated in [5]. In this paper, we work with general terminal payoff functions, neither convex nor concave.

Plugging the optimizer $q^{*,\delta}$ given by Lemma 2.8, the BSB equation (10) can be rewritten as

$$\partial_t P^\delta + \frac{1}{2}(q^{*,\delta})^2zx^2\partial^2_{xx}P^\delta + \sqrt{\delta}(q^{*,\delta}\rho zx\partial^2_{xz}P^\delta) + \delta(\frac{1}{2}z\partial^2_{zz}P^\delta + \kappa(\theta - z)\partial_z P^\delta) = 0, \tag{16}$$

with terminal condition $P^\delta(T,x,z) = h(x)$.



Figure 2. *Illustration of the derivation of $q^{*,\delta}$: if $\partial^2_{xx}P^\delta \geq 0$, whether $\hat{q}^{*,\delta}$ is positive or negative, with the requirement $q \in [d,u]$, $q^{*,\delta} = u$; otherwise $q^{*,\delta} = d$.*

2.2.3. Heuristic Expansion and Accuracy of the Approximation. We insert the expansion (11) into the main BSB equation (16) and collect terms in successive powers of $\sqrt{\delta}$. Under Assumption 2.6 that $q^{*,\delta} \to q^{*,0}$ as $\delta \to 0$, without loss of accuracy, the first order correction term P_1 is chosen as the solution to the linear equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t P_1 + \frac{1}{2}(q^{*,0})^2 z x^2 \partial^2_{xx} P_1 + q^{*,0}\rho z x \partial^2_{xz} P_0 = 0, \\ P_1(T,x,z) = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where $q^{*,0}$ is given by (14).

Since (17) is linear, the existence and uniqueness result of a smooth solution P_1 can be achieved by firstly change the variable $x \to \ln x$, and then use the classical result of [7] for the parabolic equation (17) with diffusion coefficient bounded below by $d^2 z > 0$.

Note that that the source term is proportional to the parameter ρ.

We shall show in the following that under additional regularity conditions imposed on the derivatives of P_0 and P_1, the approximation error $|P^\delta - P_0 - \sqrt{\delta}P_1|$ is of order $\mathcal{O}(\delta)$.

Assumption 2.10. *We assume polynomial growth for the following derivatives of P_0 and*

P_1:

$$\begin{cases} |\partial^2_{xz} P_0(s,x,z)| \le a_{11}(1 + x^{b_{11}} + z^{c_{11}}) \\ |\partial_z P_0(s,x,z)| \le a_{01}(1 + x^{b_{01}} + z^{c_{01}}) \\ |\partial^2_{xx} P_1(s,x,z)| \le \bar{a}_{20}(1 + x^{\bar{b}_{20}} + z^{\bar{c}_{20}}) \\ |\partial_z P_1(s,x,z)| \le \bar{a}_{01}(1 + x^{\bar{b}_{01}} + z^{\bar{c}_{01}}) \\ |\partial^2_{zz} P_1(s,x,z)| \le \bar{a}_{02}(1 + x^{\bar{b}_{02}} + z^{\bar{c}_{02}}) \end{cases} \tag{18}$$

where $a_i, b_i, c_i, \bar{a}_i, \bar{b}_i, \bar{c}_i$ *are positive integers for* $i \in (20, 11, 01, 02)$.

Theorem 2.11 (Main Theorem). *Under Assumptions 2.2, 2.6 and 2.10, the residual function* $E^\delta(t,x,z)$ *defined by*

$$E^\delta(t,x,z) := P^\delta(t,x,z) - P_0(t,x,z) - \sqrt{\delta} P_1(t,x,z) \tag{19}$$

is of order $\mathcal{O}(\delta)$. *In other words,* $\forall (t,x,z) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+$, *there exists a positive constant* C, *such that* $|E^\delta(t,x,z)| \le C\delta$, *where* C *may depend on* (t,x,z) *but not on* δ.

Recall that a function $f^\delta(t,x,z)$ is of order $\mathcal{O}(\delta^k)$, denoted $f^\delta(t,x,z) \sim \mathcal{O}(\delta^k)$, for $\forall (t,x,z) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+$, there exists a positive constant C depend on (t,x,z) but not on δ, such that

$$|f^\delta(t,x,z)| \le C\delta^k.$$

Similarly, we denote $f^\delta(t,x,z) \sim o(\delta^k)$, if

$$\limsup_{\delta \to 0} |f^\delta(t,x,z)|/\delta^k = 0.$$

3. Proof of the Main Theorem 2.11. Define the following operator

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^\delta(q) :&= \partial_t + \frac{1}{2} q^2 z x^2 \partial^2_{xx} + \sqrt{\delta} q \rho z x \partial^2_{xz} + \delta(\frac{1}{2} z \partial^2_{zz} + \kappa(\theta - z)\partial_z) \\ &= \mathcal{L}_0(q) + \sqrt{\delta}\mathcal{L}_1(q) + \delta\mathcal{L}_2, \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

where the operators $\mathcal{L}_0(q)$, $\mathcal{L}_1(q)$, and $\mathcal{L}_2$ are defined by:

$$\mathcal{L}_0(q) := \partial_t + \frac{1}{2} q^2 z x^2 \partial^2_{xx},$$

$$\mathcal{L}_1(q) := q\rho z x \partial^2_{xz},$$

$$\mathcal{L}_2 := \frac{1}{2} z \partial^2_{zz} + \kappa(\theta - z)\partial_z.$$

Note that:

- $\mathcal{L}_0(q)$ contains the time derivative and is the Black–Scholes operator $\mathcal{L}_{BS}(q\sqrt{z})$.
- $\mathcal{L}_1(q)$ contains the mixed derivative due to the covariation between X and Z.
- $\delta\mathcal{L}_2$ is the infinitesimal generator of the process Z, also denoted by $\delta\mathcal{L}_{CIR}$.

The main equation (16) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^\delta(q^{*,\delta}) P^\delta &= 0, \\ P^\delta(t,x,z) &= h(x). \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

Equation (12) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{BS}(q^{*,0})P_0 &= 0, \\ P_0(T,x,z) &= h(x). \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

Equation (17) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{BS}(q^{*,0})P_1 + \mathcal{L}_1(q^{*,0})P_0 &= 0, \\ P_1(T,x,z) &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Applying the operator $\mathcal{L}^\delta(q^{*,\delta})$ to the error term, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^\delta(q^{*,\delta})E^\delta =& \mathcal{L}^\delta(q^{*,\delta})(P^\delta - P_0 - \sqrt{\delta}P_1) \\ =& \underbrace{\mathcal{L}^\delta(q^{*,\delta})P^\delta}_{=0,\text{ eq. (21).}} - \mathcal{L}^\delta(q^{*,\delta})(P_0 + \sqrt{\delta}P_1) \\ =& -\left(\mathcal{L}_{BS}(q^{*,\delta}) + \sqrt{\delta}\mathcal{L}_1(q^{*,\delta}) + \delta\mathcal{L}_{CIR}\right)(P_0 + \sqrt{\delta}P_1) \\ =& -\mathcal{L}_{BS}(q^{*,\delta})P_0 - \sqrt{\delta}\left[\mathcal{L}_1(q^{*,\delta})P_0 + \mathcal{L}_{BS}(q^{*,\delta})P_1\right] - \delta\left[\mathcal{L}_1(q^{*,\delta})P_1 + \mathcal{L}_{CIR}P_0\right] \\ & - \delta^{\frac{3}{2}}\left[\mathcal{L}_{CIR}P_1\right] \\ =& -\underbrace{\mathcal{L}_{BS}(q^{*,0})P_0}_{=0,\text{ eq. (22).}} - (\mathcal{L}_{BS}(q^{*,\delta}) - \mathcal{L}_{BS}(q^{*,0}))P_0 - \sqrt{\delta}\Bigg[\underbrace{\mathcal{L}_1(q^{*,0})P_0 + \mathcal{L}_{BS}(q^{*,0})P_1}_{=0,\text{ eq. (23).}} \\ & + (\mathcal{L}_1(q^{*,\delta}) - \mathcal{L}_1(q^{*,0}))P_0 + (\mathcal{L}_{BS}(q^{*,\delta}) - \mathcal{L}_{BS}(q^{*,0}))P_1\Bigg] \\ & - \delta\left[\mathcal{L}_1(q^{*,\delta})P_1 + \mathcal{L}_{CIR}P_0\right] - \delta^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathcal{L}_{CIR}P_1) \\ =& -(\mathcal{L}_{BS}(q^{*,\delta}) - \mathcal{L}_{BS}(q^{*,0}))P_0 - \sqrt{\delta}\Bigg[(\mathcal{L}_1(q^{*,\delta}) - \mathcal{L}_1(q^{*,0}))P_0 \\ & + (\mathcal{L}_{BS}(q^{*,\delta}) - \mathcal{L}_{BS}(q^{*,0}))P_1\Bigg] - \delta\left[\mathcal{L}_1(q^{*,\delta})P_1 + \mathcal{L}_{CIR}P_0\right] - \delta^{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathcal{L}_{CIR}P_1) \\ =& -\frac{1}{2}[(q^{*,\delta})^2 - (q^{*,0})^2]zx^2\partial^2_{xx}P_0 \\ & - \sqrt{\delta}\left[\rho(q^{*,\delta} - q^{*,0})zx\partial^2_{xz}P_0 + \frac{1}{2}\left((q^{*,\delta})^2 - (q^{*,0})^2\right)zx^2\partial^2_{xx}P_1\right] \\ & - \delta\left[\rho(q^{*,\delta})zx\partial^2_{xz}P_1 + \frac{1}{2}z\partial^2_{zz}P_0 + \kappa(\theta - z)\partial_z P_0\right] \\ & - \delta^{\frac{3}{2}}\left[\frac{1}{2}z\partial^2_{zz}P_1 + \kappa(\theta - z)\partial_z P_1\right], \end{aligned}$$

where $q^{*,0}$ and $q^{*,\delta}$ are given in (14) and (15) respectively.

The terminal condition of E^δ is given by

$$E^\delta(T,x,z) = P^\delta(T,x,z) - P_0(T,x,z) - \sqrt{\delta}P_1(T,x,z) = 0.$$

3.1. Feynman–Kac representation of the error term. For δ sufficiently small, the optimal choice $q^{*,\delta}$ to the main BSB equation (10) is given explicitly in Lemma 2.8. Correspondingly, the asset price in the worst case scenario is a stochastic process which satisfies the SDE (1) with $(q_t) = (q^{*,\delta})$ and $r = 0$, i.e.,

$$dX_t^{*,\delta} = q^{*,\delta}\sqrt{Z_t}X_t^{*,\delta}dW_t. \tag{24}$$

Given the existence and uniqueness result of $X_t^{*,\delta}$ proved in Appendix C, we have the following probabilistic representation of $E^\delta(t,x,z)$ by Feynman–Kac formula:

$$E^\delta(t,x,z) = I_0 + \delta^{\frac{1}{2}}I_1 + \delta I_2 + \delta^{\frac{3}{2}}I_3,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
I_0 &:= \mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}\left[\int_t^T \frac{1}{2}\left((q^{*,\delta})^2 - (q^{*,0})^2\right) Z_s (X_s^{*,\delta})^2 \partial_{xx}^2 P_0(s, X_s^{*,\delta}, Z_s) ds\right],\\
I_1 &:= \mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}\left[\int_t^T \left((q^{*,\delta} - q^{*,0})\rho Z_s X_s^{*,\delta}\partial_{xz}^2 P_0(s, X_s^{*,\delta}, Z_s)\right.\right.\\
&\qquad \left.\left. + \frac{1}{2}\left((q^{*,\delta})^2 - (q^{*,0})^2\right) Z_s (X_s^{*,\delta})^2 \partial_{xx}^2 P_1(s, X_s^{*,\delta}, Z_s)\right) ds\right],\\
I_2 &:= \mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}\left[\int_t^T \left(q^{*,\delta}\rho Z_s X_s^{*,\delta}\partial_{xz}^2 P_1(s, X_s^{*,\delta}, Z_s) + \frac{1}{2}Z_s\partial_{zz}^2 P_0(s, X_s^{*,\delta}, Z_s)\right.\right.\\
&\qquad \left.\left. + \kappa(\theta - Z_s)\partial_z P_0(s, X_s^{*,\delta}, Z_s)\right) ds\right],\\
I_3 &:= \mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}\left[\int_t^T \left(\frac{1}{2}Z_s\partial_{zz}^2 P_1(s, X_s^{*,\delta}, Z_s) + \kappa(\theta - Z_s)\partial_z P_1(s, X_s^{*,\delta}, Z_s)\right) ds\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Note that for $q^{*,0}$ given in (14) and $q^{*,\delta}$ given in (15) , we have

$$q^{*,\delta} - q^{*,0} = (u-d)(\mathbb{1}_{\{\partial_{xx}^2 P^\delta \geq 0\}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{\partial_{xx}^2 P_0 \geq 0\}}), \tag{25}$$

and

$$(q^{*,\delta})^2 - (q^{*,0})^2 = (u^2 - d^2)(\mathbb{1}_{\{\partial_{xx}^2 P^\delta \geq 0\}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{\partial_{xx}^2 P_0 \geq 0\}}). \tag{26}$$

Also note that $\{q^{*,\delta} \neq q^{*,0}\} = A_{t,z}^\delta$ defined in (13).

In order to show that E^δ is of order $\mathcal{O}(\delta)$, it suffices to show that I_0 is of order $\mathcal{O}(\delta)$, I_1 is of order $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\delta})$, and I_2 and I_3 are uniformly bounded in δ. Clearly, I_0 is the main term that directly determines the order of the error term E^δ.

3.2. Control of the term I_0. In this section, we are going to handle the dependence in δ of the process $X^{*,\delta}$ by a time-change argument.

Theorem 3.1. *Under Assumptions 2.2, 2.4 and 2.6, there exists a positive constant M_0, such that*

$$|I_0| \leq M_0 \delta$$

where M_0 may depend on (t,x,z) but not on δ. That is, I_0 is of order $\mathcal{O}(\delta)$.

Proof. By Proposition 2.5 and $A^{\delta}_{s,z}$ being compact, there exists a constant C_0 such that

$$|\partial^2_{xx} P_0(s, X^{*,\delta}_s, Z_s)| \leq C_0\sqrt{\delta}, \text{ for } X^{*,\delta}_s \in A^{\delta}_{s,z}.$$

Then, since $0 < d \leq q^{*,\delta}, q^{*,0} \leq u$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |I_0| &\leq \mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}\left[\int_t^T \frac{1}{2}|(q^{*,\delta})^2 - (q^{*,0})^2| Z_s (X^{*,\delta}_s)^2 |\partial^2_{xx} P_0(s, X^{*,\delta}_s, Z_s)| ds\right] \\ &\leq \frac{u^2}{2d^2} C_0\sqrt{\delta}\, \mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}\left[\int_t^T \mathbb{1}_{\{X^{*,\delta}_s \in A^{\delta}_{s,z}\}} (q^{*,\delta})^2 Z_s (X^{*,\delta}_s)^2 ds\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

In order to show that I_0 is of order $\mathcal{O}(\delta)$, it suffices to show that there exists a constant C_1 such that

$$\mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}\left[\int_t^T \mathbb{1}_{\{X^{*,\delta}_s \in A^{\delta}_{s,z}\}} \sigma_s^2 ds\right] \leq C_1\sqrt{\delta}, \tag{28}$$

where $\sigma_s := q^{*,\delta}\sqrt{Z_s} X^{*,\delta}_s$ and $dX^{*,\delta}_s = \sigma_s dW_s$ by (24). Define the stopping time

$$\tau(v) := \inf\{s > t; \langle X^{*,\delta}\rangle_s > v\},$$

where

$$\langle X^{*,\delta}\rangle_s = \int_t^s \sigma^2(X^{*,\delta}_u) du.$$

Then according to Theorem 4.6 (time-change for martingales) of [13], we know that $X^{*,\delta}_{\tau(v)} = B_v$ is a standard one-dimensional Brownian motion on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}^B_v, \mathbb{Q}^B)$.

From the definition of $\tau(v)$ given above, we have

$$\int_t^{\tau(v)} \sigma^2(X^{*,\delta}_s) ds = v,$$

which tells us that the inverse function of $\tau(v)$ is

$$\tau^{-1}(T) = \int_t^T \sigma^2(X^{*,\delta}_s) ds. \tag{29}$$

Next use the substitution $s = \tau(v)$ and for any $i \in [1, m(v)]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_t^T \mathbb{1}_{\{|X_s^{*,\delta}-x_i|<C\sqrt{\delta}\}}\sigma^2(X_s^{*,\delta})ds &= \int_t^{\tau^{-1}(T)} \mathbb{1}_{\{|X_{\tau(v)}^{*,\delta}-x_i|<C\sqrt{\delta}\}}\sigma^2(X_{\tau(v)}^{*,\delta})d\tau(v)\\ &= \int_t^{\tau^{-1}(T)} \mathbb{1}_{\{|X_{\tau(v)}^{*,\delta}-x_i|<C\sqrt{\delta}\}}\sigma^2(X_{\tau(v)}^{*,\delta})\frac{1}{\sigma^2(X_{\tau(v)}^{*,\delta})}dv\\ &= \int_t^{\tau^{-1}(T)} \mathbb{1}_{\{|X_{\tau(v)}^{*,\delta}-x_i|<C\sqrt{\delta}\}}dv\\ &= \int_t^{\tau^{-1}(T)} \mathbb{1}_{\{|B_v-x_i|<C\sqrt{\delta}\}}dv.\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

Note that on the set $\{|B_v - x_i| < C\sqrt{\delta}\}$, we have $(X_s^{*,\delta})^2 \le (x_i + C\sqrt{\delta})^2 \le D$, where D is a positive constant, and then by (29) we have

$$\tau^{-1}(T) = \int_t^T (q^{*,\delta}\sqrt{Z_s}X_s^{*,\delta})^2 ds \le Du^2T \sup_{t\le s\le T} Z_s. \tag{31}$$

Then from (30) and (31), by decomposing in $\{\sup_{t\le s\le T} Z_s \le M\}$ and $\{\sup_{t\le s\le T} Z_s > M\}$ for any $M > z$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}\left[\int_t^{\tau^{-1}(T)} \mathbb{1}_{\{|B_v-x_i|<C\sqrt{\delta}\}}dv\right] \sim \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\delta}). \tag{32}$$

with details for this last step given in Appendix D.

By finite union over the x_i's we deduce (28) and the theorem follows. ∎

Remark 3.2. *As we noted in Remark 2.7, if the third derivative of P_0 with respect to x vanishes on the set $S^0_{t,z}$, the size of I_i^δ is of order $\mathcal{O}(\delta^\alpha)$ for $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$. In that case, (27) still holds but (32) would be of order $\mathcal{O}(\delta^\alpha)$, and then the result of Theorem 3.1 and the accuracy in the Main Theorem 2.11 would be of order $\mathcal{O}(\delta^{\alpha+1/2})$.*

3.3. Control of the term I_1.

Theorem 3.3. *Under Assumptions 2.2, 2.4, 2.6 and 2.10, there exists a constant M_1, such that*

$$|I_1| \le M_1\sqrt{\delta}$$

where M_1 may depend on (t, x, z) but not on δ. That is, I_1 is of order $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\delta})$.

Proof. Under Assumption 2.10 and $0 < d \le q^{*,\delta}, q^{*,0} \le u$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
|I_1| \le \mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}\Bigg[\int_t^T \Bigg(&|q^{*,\delta} - q^{*,0}|\rho Z_s X_s^{*,\delta}|\partial^2_{xz} P_0(s, X_s^{*,\delta}, Z_s)| \\
&+ \frac{1}{2}|(q^{*,\delta})^2 - (q^{*,0})^2| Z_s (X_s^{*,\delta})^2 |\partial^2_{xx} P_1(s, X_s^{*,\delta}, Z_s)|\Bigg) ds\Bigg] \\
\le \frac{\rho u}{d^2}\mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}&\left[\int_t^T \mathbb{1}_{\{X_s^{*,\delta} \in A^\delta_{s,z}\}} (q^{*,\delta})^2 Z_s X_s^{*,\delta} a_{11}(1 + (X_s^{*,\delta})^{b_{11}} + Z_s^{c_{11}}) ds\right] \\
+ \frac{u^2}{2d^2}\mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}&\left[\int_t^T \mathbb{1}_{\{X_s^{*,\delta} \in A^\delta_{s,z}\}} (q^{*,\delta})^2 Z_s (X_s^{*,\delta})^2 \bar{a}_{20}(1 + (X_s^{*,\delta})^{\bar{b}_{20}} + Z_s^{\bar{c}_{20}}) ds\right].
\end{aligned}
$$

Using the same techniques in proving Theorem 3.1, the result that $X_s^{*,\delta}$ and Z_s have finite moments uniformly in δ, and $X_s^{*,\delta} \le C(X_s^{*,\delta})^2$ on $\{X_s^{*,\delta} \in A^\delta_{s,z}\}$, we can deduce that I_1 is of order $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\delta})$. ∎

With the result of theorem 3.1 that I_0 is of order $\mathcal{O}(\delta)$, the result of theorem 3.3 that I_1 is of order $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\delta})$, and the result that I_2 and I_3 are uniformly bounded in δ where derivation of these bounds are given in the appendix E, we can see that

$$E^\delta(t,x,z) = I_0 + \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} I_1 + \delta I_2 + \delta^{\frac{3}{2}} I_3,$$

is of order $\mathcal{O}(\delta)$, which completes the proof of the main Theorem 2.11.

4. Numerical Illustration. In this section, we use the nontrivial example in [6], and consider a symmetric European butterfly spread with the payoff function

$$h(x) = (x - 90)^+ - 2(x - 100)^+ + (x - 110)^+ \tag{33}$$

presented in Figure 3. Although this payoff function does not satisfy the conditions imposed in this paper, we could consider a regularization of it, that is to introduce a small parameter for the regularization and then remove this small parameter asymptotically without changing the accuracy estimate. This can be achieved by considering $P_0(T - \epsilon, x)$ as the regularized payoff (see [18] for details on this regularization procedure in the context of the Black–Scholes equation).

The original problem is to solve the fully nonlinear PDE (10) in dimension two for the worst case scenario price, which is not analytically solvable in practice. In the following, we use the Crank–Nicolson version of the weighted finite difference method in [9], which corresponds to the case of solving P_0 in one dimension. To extend the original algorithm to our two dimensional case, we apply discretization grids on time and two state variables. Denote $u^n_{i,j} := P_0(t_n, x_i, z_j)$, $v^n_{i,j} := P_1(t_n, x_i, z_j)$ and $w^n_{i,j} := P^\delta(t_n, x_i, z_j)$, where $n = 0, 1, \cdots, N$ stands for the index of time, $i = 0, 1, \cdots, I$ stands for the index of the asset price process, and $j = 0, 1, \cdots, J$ stands for the index of the volatility process. In the following, we build a uniform grid of size 100×100 and use 20 time steps.



Figure 3. *The payoff function of a symmetric European butterfly spread.*

We use the classical discrete approximations to the continuous derivatives:

$$\partial_x(w^n_{i,j}) = \frac{w^n_{i+1,j} - w^n_{i-1,j}}{2\Delta x} \qquad \partial^2_{zz}(w^n_{i,j}) = \frac{w^n_{i,j+1} + w^n_{i,j-1} - 2w^n_{i,j}}{\Delta z^2}$$

$$\partial^2_{xx}(w^n_{i,j}) = \frac{w^n_{i+1,j} + w^n_{i-1,j} - 2w^n_{i,j}}{\Delta x^2} \qquad \partial_z(w^n_{i,j}) = \frac{w^n_{i,j+1} - w^n_{i,j-1}}{2\Delta z}$$

$$\partial^2_{xz}(w^n_{i,j}) = \frac{w^n_{i+1,j+1} + w^n_{i-1,j-1} - w^n_{i-1,j+1} - w^n_{i+1,j-1}}{4\Delta x \Delta z} \qquad \partial_t(w^n_{i,j}) = \frac{u^{n+1}_{i,j} - u^n_{i,j}}{\Delta t}$$

To simplify our algorithms and facilitate the implementation by matrix operations, we denote the following operators without any parameters:

$$L_{xx} = zx^2\partial^2_{xx} \qquad L_{zz} = z\partial^2_{zz} \qquad L_{xz} = xz\partial^2_{xz}$$
$$L_x = x\partial_x \qquad L_{z1} = \partial_z \qquad L_{z2} = z\partial_z$$

4.1. Simulation of P_0 and P_1. Note that in the PDE (17) for P_1 , $q^{*,0}$ must be solved in the PDE (12) for P_0 . Therefore, we solve P_0 and P_1 together in each 100×100 space grids and iteratively back to the starting time.

Algorithm 1 Algorithm to solve P_0 and P_1

1: Set $u^N_{i,j} = h(x_I)$ and $v^N_{i,j} = 0$.
2: Solve $u^n_{i,j}$ (predictor)

$$\frac{u^{n+1}_{i,j} - u^n_{i,j}}{\Delta t} + [\frac{1}{2}(q^{n+1}_{i,j})^2 L_{xx}](\frac{u^{n+1}_{i,j} + u^n_{i,j}}{2}) = 0$$

with

$$q_{i,j}^{n+1} = u\mathbb{1}_{\{u^2 L_{xx}(u_{i,j}^{n+1}) \geq d^2 L_{xx}(u_{i,j}^{n+1})\}} + d\mathbb{1}_{\{u^2 L_{xx}(u_{i,j}^{n+1}) < d^2 L_{xx}(u_{i,j}^{n+1})\}}$$

3: Solve $u_{i,j}^n$ (corrector)

$$\frac{u_{i,j}^{n+1} - u_{i,j}^n}{\Delta t} + [\frac{1}{2}(q_{i,j}^n)^2 L_{xx}](\frac{u_{i,j}^{n+1} + u_{i,j}^n}{2}) = 0$$

with

$$q_{i,j}^n = u\mathbb{1}_{\{u^2 L_{xx}(\frac{u_{i,j}^{n+1}+u_{i,j}^n}{2}) \geq d^2 L_{xx}(\frac{u_{i,j}^{n+1}+u_{i,j}^n}{2})\}} + d\mathbb{1}_{\{u^2 L_{xx}(\frac{u_{i,j}^{n+1}+u_{i,j}^n}{2}) < d^2 L_{xx}(\frac{u_{i,j}^{n+1}+u_{i,j}^n}{2})\}}$$

4: Solve $v_{i,j}^n$

$$\frac{v_{i,j}^{n+1} - v_{i,j}^n}{\Delta t} + \frac{1}{2}(q_{i,j}^n)^2 L_{xx}(\frac{v_{i,j}^{n+1} + v_{i,j}^n}{2}) + \rho(q_{i,j}^n) L_{xz}(\frac{u_{i,j}^{n+1} + u_{i,j}^n}{2}) = 0$$

Throughout all the experiments, we set $X_0 = 100$, $Z_0 = 0.04$, $T = 0.25$, $r = 0$, $d = 0.75$, and $u = 1.25$. Therefore, the two deterministic bounds for P_0 are given by $\underline{\sigma} = d\sqrt{Z_0} = 0.15$ and $\overline{\sigma} = u\sqrt{Z_0} = 0.25$, which are standard Uncertain Volatility model bounds setup. From Figure 4, we can see that P_0 is above the Black–Scholes prices with constant volatility 0.15 and 0.25 all the time, which corresponds to the fact that we need extra cash to superreplicate the option when facing the model ambiguity. As expected, the Black–Scholes prices with constant volatility 0.25 (resp. 0.15) is a good approximation when P_0 is convex (resp. concave).

4.2. Simulation of P_δ. Considering the main BSB equation given by (10), if we relax the restriction $q \in [d, u]$ to $q \in \mathbb{R}$, the optimizer of

$$f(q) := \frac{1}{2}q^2 z x^2 \partial_{xx}^2 P^\delta + q\rho z x \sqrt{\delta}\partial_{xz}^2 P^\delta$$

is given by $\hat{q}^{*,\delta} = -\frac{\rho\sqrt{\delta}\partial_{xz}^2 P^\delta}{x\partial_{xx}^2 P^\delta}$, and the maximum value of $f(q)$ is given by $f(\hat{q}^{*,\delta}) = -\frac{\rho^2\delta z(\partial_{xz}^2 P^\delta)^2}{2\partial_{xx}^2 P^\delta}$. Therefore,

$$\sup_{q\in[d,u]} f(q) = f(u) \vee f(d) \vee f(\hat{q}^{*,\delta}).$$

To simplify the algorithm, we denote

$$L_A = \frac{1}{2}u^2 L_{xx} + u\rho\sqrt{\delta}L_{xz}, \qquad L_B = \frac{1}{2}d^2 L_{xx} + d\rho\sqrt{\delta}L_{xz}, \qquad L_C = -\frac{\rho^2\delta(L_{xz})^2}{2L_{xx}}.$$

Algorithm 2 Algorithm to solve P^δ

1: Set $w_{i,j}^N = h(x_I)$.



Figure 4. *The blue curve represents the usual uncertain volatility model price P_0 with two deterministic bounds* 0.15 *and* 0.25*, the red curve marked with "- -" represents the Black–Scholes prices with $\sigma = 0.25$, the green curve marked with '-.' represents the Black–Scholes prices with $\sigma = 0.15$.*

2: Predictor:

$$\frac{w_{i,j}^{n+1} - w_{i,j}^{n}}{\Delta t} + [\frac{1}{2}(q_{i,j}^{n+1})^2 L_{xx} + (q_{i,j}^{n+1})\rho\sqrt{\delta}L_{xz} + \delta(\frac{1}{2}L_{zz} + \kappa\theta L_{z1} - \kappa L_{z2})](\frac{w_{i,j}^{n+1} + w_{i,j}^{n}}{2}) = 0$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} q_{i,j}^{n+1} =& u\mathbb{1}_{\{L_A(w_{i,j}^{n+1})=\max\{L_A,L_B,L_C\}(w_{i,j}^{n+1})\}} + d\mathbb{1}_{\{L_B(w_{i,j}^{n+1})=\max\{L_A,L_B,L_C\}(w_{i,j}^{n+1})\}} \\ & - \frac{\rho\sqrt{\delta}L_{xz}}{L_{xx}}(w_{i,j}^{n+1})\mathbb{1}_{\{L_C(w_{i,j}^{n+1})=\max\{L_A,L_B,L_C\}(w_{i,j}^{n+1})\}} \end{aligned}$$

3: Corrector:

$$\frac{w_{i,j}^{n+1} - w_{i,j}^{n}}{\Delta t} + [\frac{1}{2}(q_{i,j}^{n})^2 L_{xx} + (q_{i,j}^{n})\rho\sqrt{\delta}L_{xz} + \delta(\frac{1}{2}L_{zz} + \kappa\theta L_{z1} - \kappa L_{z2})](\frac{w_{i,j}^{n+1} + w_{i,j}^{n}}{2}) = 0$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} q_{i,j}^{n} =& u\mathbb{1}_{\{L_A(\frac{w_{i,j}^{n+1}+w_{i,j}^{n}}{2})=\max\{L_A,L_B,L_C\}(\frac{w_{i,j}^{n+1}+w_{i,j}^{n}}{2})\}} + d\mathbb{1}_{\{L_B(\frac{w_{i,j}^{n+1}+w_{i,j}^{n}}{2})=\max\{L_A,L_B,L_C\}(\frac{w_{i,j}^{n+1}+w_{i,j}^{n}}{2})\}} \\ & - \frac{\rho\sqrt{\delta}L_{xz}}{L_{xx}}(\frac{w_{i,j}^{n+1} + w_{i,j}^{n}}{2})\mathbb{1}_{\{L_C(\frac{w_{i,j}^{n+1}+w_{i,j}^{n}}{2})=\max\{L_A,L_B,L_C\}(\frac{w_{i,j}^{n+1}+w_{i,j}^{n}}{2})\}} \end{aligned}$$

We set $\kappa = 15$ and $\theta = 0.04$, which satisfies the Feller condition required in this paper.

4.3. Error analysis. To visualize the approximation as δ vanishes, we plot P^δ, P_0 and $P_0 + \sqrt{\delta}P_1$ with ten equally spaced values of δ from 0.05 to 0, and consider a typical case of correlation $\rho = -0.9$ (see [12]). In Figure 5, we see that the first order prices capture the main feature of the worst case scenario prices for different values of δ. As can be seen, for δ very small, the approximation performs very well and it worth noting that, even for δ not very small such as 0.1, it still performs well.



Figure 5. *The red curve marked with "- -" represents the worst case scenario prices P^δ; the blue curve represents the leading term P_0; the black curve marked with '-.' represents the approximation $P_0 + \sqrt{\delta}P_1$.*

To investigate the convergence of the error of our approximation as δ decrease, we compute



Figure 6. *Error for different values of δ*



Figure 7. *The red curve marked with "- -" represents $\partial^2_{xx}P^\delta$; the blue curve represents $\partial^2_{xx}P_0$.*

the error of the approximation for each δ as following

$$\text{error}(\delta) = \sup_{x,z} |P^\delta(0,x,z) - P_0(0,x,z) - \sqrt{\delta}P_1(0,x,z)|.$$

As shown in Figure 6, the error decreases linearly as δ decreases (at least for δ small enough), as predicted by our Main Theorem 2.11.

Remark 4.1. *In Remark 2.7, for the case that P_0 has a third derivative with respect to x, which does not vanish on the set $S^0_{t,z}$, we have Assumption 2.6 (ii) as a direct result. In Figure 7, we can see that the slopes at the zero points of $\partial^2_{xx}P^\delta$ and $\partial^2_{xx}P_0$ are not 0, hence for this symmetric butterfly spread, Assumption 2.6 (ii) is satisfied.*

5. Conclusion. In this paper, we have proposed the uncertain volatility models with stochastic bounds driven by a CIR process. Our method is not limited to the CIR process and can be used with any other positive stochastic processes such as positive functions of an OU process. We further studied the asymptotic behavior of the worst case scenario option prices in the regime of slowly varying stochastic bounds. This study not only helps understanding that uncertain volatility models with stochastic bounds are more flexible than uncertain volatility models with constant bounds for option pricing and risk management, but also provides an approximation procedure for worst-case scenario option prices when the bounds are slowly varying. From the numerical results, we see that the approximation procedure works really well even when the payoff function does not satisfy the requirements enforced in this paper, and even when δ is not so small such as $\delta = 0.1$.

Note that as risk evaluation in a financial management requires more accuracy and efficiency nowadays, our approximation procedure highly improves the estimation and still maintains the same efficiency level as the regular uncertain volatility models. Moreover, the worst case scenario price P^δ (10) has to be recomputed for any change in its parameters κ, θ and δ. However, the PDEs (12) and (17) for P_0 and P_1 are independent of these parameters, so the approximation requires only to compute P_0 and P_1 once for all values of κ, θ and δ.

Appendix A. Moments of Z_t and X_t.

Proposition A.1. *The process Z has finite moments of any order uniformly in $0 \le \delta \le 1$ for $t \le T$.*

The proof is given by Lemma 4.9 in [5]. Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}\left[\int_t^T |Z_s|^k ds\right] \le \mathbb{E}_{(0,z)}\left[\int_0^T |Z_s|^k ds\right] \le C_k(T,z), \tag{34}$$

where $C_k(T,z)$ may depend on (k,T,z) but not on δ.

Denote the moment generating function of the integrated CIR process given $Z_s|_{s=t} = z$ as

$$M^\delta_z(\eta) := \mathbb{E}_{(t,z)}[\exp(\eta \int_0^t Z_s ds)], \quad \text{for } \eta \in \mathbb{R},$$

and then we have the following lemma:

Proposition A.2. *For $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$ independent of δ and t, $M^\delta_z(\eta)$ is bounded uniformly in $0 \le \delta \le 1$ and $t \le T$. That is $|M^\delta_z(\eta)| \le N(T,z,\eta) < \infty$, where $N(T,z,\eta)$ is independent of δ and t.*

Proof. The moment generating function of the integrated CIR process has an explicit form, which is presented in Section 5 of [15]. That is

$$M^\delta_z(\eta) = \Psi(\eta,t)e^{-z\Xi(\eta,t)},$$

where

$$\Psi(\eta,t)=\left(\frac{\bar{b}e^{\delta\kappa\frac{t}{2}}}{\bar{b}\frac{e^{\bar{b}\frac{t}{2}}+e^{-\bar{b}\frac{t}{2}}}{2}+\delta\kappa\frac{e^{\bar{b}\frac{t}{2}}-e^{-\bar{b}\frac{t}{2}}}{2}}\right)^{2\kappa},$$

$$\Xi(\eta,t)=\left(\frac{2\eta\frac{e^{\bar{b}\frac{t}{2}}-e^{-\bar{b}\frac{t}{2}}}{2}}{\bar{b}\frac{e^{\bar{b}\frac{t}{2}}+e^{-\bar{b}\frac{t}{2}}}{2}+\delta\kappa\frac{e^{\bar{b}\frac{t}{2}}-e^{-\bar{b}\frac{t}{2}}}{2}}\right)^{2\kappa},$$

and

$$\bar{b}=\sqrt{b^2-2\eta\sigma^2}=\sqrt{\delta^2\kappa^2-2\eta\delta}.$$

In the following, we are going to show $|M_z^\delta(\eta)|\le N(T,z,\eta)<\infty$, where $N(T,z,\eta)$ is independent of δ and t.

- If $\delta^2\kappa^2-2\eta\delta\ge 0$, we have $\bar{b}\ge 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi(\eta,t)&\le\left(\frac{\bar{b}e^{\delta\kappa\frac{t}{2}}}{\bar{b}\frac{e^{\bar{b}\frac{t}{2}}+e^{-\bar{b}\frac{t}{2}}}{2}}\right)^{2\kappa} && (\delta\kappa\frac{e^{\bar{b}\frac{t}{2}}-e^{-\bar{b}\frac{t}{2}}}{2}\ge 0)\\ &\le(e^{\delta\kappa\frac{t}{2}})^{2\kappa} && (\frac{e^{\bar{b}\frac{t}{2}}+e^{-\bar{b}\frac{t}{2}}}{2}\ge 1)\\ &\le(e^{\kappa\frac{T}{2}})^{2\kappa}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\Xi(\eta,t)\ge 0$, we have $e^{-z\Xi(\eta,t)}\le 1$. Therefore

$$M_z^\delta(\eta)=\Psi(\eta,t)e^{-z\Xi(\eta,t)}\le(e^{\kappa\frac{T}{2}})^{2\kappa}.$$

- If $\delta^2\kappa^2-2\eta\delta<0$, let $v=\sqrt{2\eta\delta-\delta^2\kappa^2}$ which is positive, then

$$\begin{aligned}M_z^\delta(\eta)&=\Psi(\eta,t)e^{-z\Xi(\eta,t)}\\ &=\left(\frac{ive^{\delta\kappa\frac{t}{2}}}{iv\cos(\frac{vt}{2})+\delta\kappa i\sin(\frac{vt}{2})}\right)^{2\kappa}\exp\left[-z(\frac{2\eta i\sin(\frac{vt}{2})}{iv\cos(\frac{vt}{2})+\delta\kappa i\sin(\frac{vt}{2})})^{2\kappa}\right]\\ &=\left(\frac{ve^{\delta\kappa\frac{t}{2}}}{v\cos(\frac{vt}{2})+\delta\kappa\sin(\frac{vt}{2})}\right)^{2\kappa}\exp\left[-z(\frac{2\eta\sin(\frac{vt}{2})}{v\cos(\frac{vt}{2})+\delta\kappa\sin(\frac{vt}{2})})^{2\kappa}\right].\end{aligned}$$

  - In the limit of small v, since

$$\left(\frac{2\eta\sin(\frac{vt}{2})}{v\cos(\frac{vt}{2})+\delta\kappa\sin(\frac{vt}{2})}\right)^{2\kappa}\ge 0),$$

we have

$$M_z^\delta(\eta) \le \left(\frac{ve^{\delta\kappa\frac{t}{2}}}{v\cos(\frac{vt}{2})+\delta\kappa\sin(\frac{vt}{2})}\right)^{2\kappa}$$
$$= \left(\frac{ve^{\delta\kappa\frac{t}{2}}}{v(1+\mathcal{O}(v^2t^2))+\delta\kappa(\frac{vt}{2}+\mathcal{O}(v^3t^3))}\right)^{2\kappa}$$
$$= \left(\frac{e^{\delta\kappa\frac{t}{2}}}{1+\frac{\delta\kappa t}{2}+\mathcal{O}(v^2t^2)}\right)^{2\kappa}.$$

There exists v_0 independent of δ and t, such that for $v < v_0$, $M_z^\delta(\eta) \le \left(\frac{e^{\kappa\frac{T}{2}}}{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{2\kappa}$.

Note that $v < v_0$ corresponds to a open region of δ, namely $\delta \in I_1 \subset [0,1]$.

– Consider $\delta \in [0,1]\setminus I_1$, and then consider $v\cos(\frac{vt}{2})+\delta\kappa\sin(\frac{vt}{2})$ in a small neighborhood of 0. Near these points, notice that v is not in a small neighborhood of 0, which implies that $\sin(\frac{vt}{2})$ is not in a small neighborhood of 0.
From $\frac{1}{x^n}e^{-\frac{a}{x}} \to 0$, as $x \to 0$, for any $a > 0$ applied to $x = v\cos(\frac{vt}{2})+\delta\kappa\sin(\frac{vt}{2})$, we deduce that there exists an open subset $I_2 \subset [0,1]\setminus I_1$, such that $M_z^\delta(\eta) \le M_1(T,z,\eta)$, which is independent of δ and t.
– Lastly, on $[0,1]\setminus(I_1\cup I_2)$, which is a closed region and thus compact, $M_z(\eta)$ is well-defined and continuous with respect to δ and t. So there exists $M_2(T,z,\eta)$ independent of δ and t, such that $|M_z^\delta(\eta)| \le M_2(T,z,\eta)$.

In sum, taking $N = \max\{(2e^{\kappa\frac{T}{2}})^{2\kappa}, M_1, M_2\}$, which is independent of δ and t, we have $|M_z^\delta(\eta)| \le N(T,z,\eta)$ (the uniform bound), as desired. ∎

By this result, we have the following Proposition:

Proposition A.3. *The process X has finite moments of any order uniformly in $0 \le \delta \le 1$ for $t \le T$.*

Proof. For the process X_t satisfying the SDE

$$dX_t = rX_t dt + q_t\sqrt{Z_t}X_t dW_t,$$

where $q_t \in [d,u]$ and Z_t is the CIR process satisfies SDE (4), for each finite $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
X_{s+t}^n =& x^n \exp\left(nrs - \frac{n}{2}\int_t^{s+t}(q_v\sqrt{Z_v})^2dv + n\int_t^{s+t}q_v\sqrt{Z_v}dW_v\right)\\
=& x^n\exp\left(nrs+\frac{n^2-n}{2}\int_t^{s+t}(q_v\sqrt{Z_v})^2dv\right)\\
&\times\exp\left(-\frac{n^2}{2}\int_t^{s+t}(q_v\sqrt{Z_v})^2dv + n\int_t^{s+t}q_v\sqrt{Z_v}dW_v\right)\\
\le& x^n\exp\left(nrs+\frac{n^2-n}{2}\int_t^{s+t}u^2Z_vdv\right)\\
&\times\exp\left(-\frac{n^2}{2}\int_t^{s+t}(q_v\sqrt{Z_v})^2dv + n\int_t^{s+t}q_v\sqrt{Z_v}dW_v\right),
\end{aligned}$$

and the last step follows by the inequality $q_v < u$.

The Novikov condition is satisfied thanks to Proposition A.2, that is,

$$\mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}\left[\exp\left(\frac{1}{2}\int_t^{s+t}(nq\sqrt{Z_v})^2dv\right)\right] \le \mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}\left[\exp\left(\frac{n^2u^2}{2}\int_t^{s+t}Z_vdv\right)\right] = M_z^\delta(\frac{n^2u^2}{2}) < \infty.$$

Now we know that

$$\Lambda_s = \exp\left(-\frac{n^2}{2}\int_t^{s+t}(q_v\sqrt{Z_v})^2dv + n\int_t^{s+t}q_v\sqrt{Z_v}dW_v\right)$$

is a martingale.

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}[X_{s+t}^n] &\le x^n\exp(nrs)\mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}\left[\exp(\frac{(n^2-n)u^2}{2}\int_t^{s+t}Z_vdv)\right]\\ &= x^n\exp(nrs)M_z^\delta\left(\frac{(n^2-n)u^2}{2}\right)\\ &\le x^n\exp(nrs)N(T,z,\frac{(n^2-n)u^2}{2}),\\ &\le x^n\exp(nrs)N(T,z,\frac{(n^2-n)u^2}{2}), \qquad \text{(Proposition A.2)}\end{aligned}$$

where the upper bound $x^n\exp(nrs)N(T,z,\frac{(n^2-n)u^2}{2})$ is independent of δ and t. ∎

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}[\int_t^T|X_s|^kds] \le \mathbb{E}_{(0,x,z)}[\int_0^T|X_s|^kds] \le N_k(T,x,z), \tag{35}$$

where $N_k(T,x,z)$ may depend on (k,T,x,z) but not on $0 \le \delta \le 1$.

Appendix B. Proof of Proposition 2.1. Integrating over $[t,T]$ the SDE (5) and the SDE (6), we have

$$X_T^\delta = x + \int_t^T rX_s^\delta ds + \int_t^T q_s\sqrt{Z_s}X_s^\delta dW_s \tag{36}$$

and

$$X_T^0 = x + \int_t^T rX_s^0 ds + \int_t^T q_s\sqrt{z}X_s^0 dW_s. \tag{37}$$

The difference of (36) and (37) is given by

$$\begin{aligned}X_T^\delta - X_T^0 &= \int_t^T r(X_s^\delta - X_s^0)ds + \int_t^T q_s(\sqrt{Z_s}X_s^\delta - \sqrt{z}X_s^0)dW_s\\ &= \int_t^T r(X_s^\delta - X_s^0)ds + \int_t^T q_s\sqrt{z}(X_s^\delta - X_s^0)dW_s + \int_t^T q_s(\sqrt{Z_s}-\sqrt{z})X_s^\delta dW_s.\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

Let $Y_s = X_s^\delta - X_s^0$, then $Y_t = 0$ and

$$Y_T = \int_t^T rY_s ds + \int_t^T q_s\sqrt{z}Y_s dW_s + \int_t^T q_s(\sqrt{Z_s} - \sqrt{z})X_s^\delta dW_s. \tag{39}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}[Y_T^2] \\
\leq& 3\mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}[(\int_t^T rY_s ds)^2 + (\int_t^T q_s\sqrt{z}Y_s dW_s)^2 + (\int_t^T q_s(\sqrt{Z_s} - \sqrt{z})X_s^\delta dW_s)^2] \\
\leq& \int_t^T (3Tr^2 + 3u^2 z)\mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}[Y_s^2]ds + \underbrace{3u^2 \int_t^T \mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}[(\sqrt{Z_s} - \sqrt{z})^2 (X_s^\delta)^2]ds}_{R(\delta)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

Notice that only the upper bound of q is used, which gives the uniform convergence in q. Also note that using the result that X_t and Z_t have finite moments uniformly in δ, we can show that $|R(\delta)| \leq C\delta$, where $C = C(T, \theta, u, d, z)$ is independent of δ.

Denote $f(T) = \mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}(Y_T^2)$ and $\lambda = 3Tr^2 + 3u^2 z > 0$, then equation (40) can be written as

$$f(T) \leq \int_t^T \lambda f(s)ds + C\delta \leq \delta \int_t^T C\lambda e^{\lambda(T-s)}ds + C\delta$$

Therefore, by Gronwall inequality,

$$\mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}(X_T^\delta - X_T^0)^2 = \mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}Y_T^2 = f(T) \leq C'\delta,$$

and the Proposition follows.

Appendix C. Existence and uniqueness of ($X_t^{*,\delta}$). For the existence and uniqueness of $X_t^{*,\delta}$, we consider the transformation

$$Y_t^{*,\delta} := \log X_t^{*,\delta},$$

which is well defined for any $t < \tau^\epsilon$, where for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau^\epsilon :&= \inf\{t > 0 | X_t^{*,\delta} = \epsilon \quad \text{or} \quad X_t^{*,\delta} = 1/\epsilon\} \\
&= \inf\{t > 0 | Y_t^{*,\delta} = \log\epsilon \quad \text{or} \quad Y_t^{*,\delta} = -\log\epsilon\}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Itô's formula, the process $Y_t^{*,\delta}$ satisfies the following SDE:

$$dY_t^{*,\delta} = -\frac{1}{2}(q^{*,\delta})^2 Z_t dt + q^{*,\delta}\sqrt{Z_t}dW_t. \tag{41}$$

Note that the diffusion coefficient satisfies

$$q^{*,\delta}\sqrt{Z_t} \geq d\sqrt{Z_t} > 0,$$

and is bounded away from 0, hence by Theorem 1 in section 2.6 of [14] and the result 7.3.3 of [20], the SDE (41) has a unique weak solution. Consequently, we have a unique solution to the SDE (24) until τ^ϵ for any $\epsilon > 0$. In order to show (24) has a unique solution, it suffices to prove that

$$\lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \mathbb{Q}(\tau^\epsilon < T) = 0,$$

for any $T > 0$.

First, for any $t \in [0, T]$,

$$Y_t^{*,\delta} = \int_0^t -\frac{1}{2}(q^{*,\delta})^2 Z_s ds + \int_0^t q^{*,\delta}\sqrt{Z_s} dW_s.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}|Y_t^{*,\delta}| &\le \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^t \frac{1}{2}(q^{*,\delta})^2 Z_s ds\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^t q^{*,\delta}\sqrt{Z_s} dW_s\right] \\ &= A + B.\end{aligned}$$

For term A, by equation (34), we have

$$A \le \frac{1}{2}u^2 \int_0^t \mathbb{E}[Z_s] ds \le \frac{1}{2}u^2 C_1(T, z).$$

For term B, we have,

$$\begin{aligned}B &\le \left(\mathbb{E}\left(\int_0^t q^{*,\delta}\sqrt{Z_s} dW_s\right)^2\right)^{1/2} && \text{(Cauchy–Schwartz inequality)} \\ &= \left(\int_0^t \mathbb{E}\left((q^{*,\delta})^2 Z_s\right) ds\right)^{1/2} && \text{(Itô isometry)} \\ &\le \left(\int_0^t u^2 \mathbb{E}(Z_s) ds\right)^{1/2} && (d \le q^{*,\delta} \le u) \\ &\le u\sqrt{C_1(T, z)} && \text{(equation(34))}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, there exists a constant $D = D(T, z, u)$ such that $\mathbb{E}|Y_t^{*,\delta}| \le D$.

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{Q}(\sup_{t\in[0,T]} |Y_t^{*,\delta}| > |\log\epsilon|) &= 1 - \mathbb{Q}(|Y_t^{*,\delta}| \le |\log\epsilon| \text{ for all } 0 \le t \le T) \\ &\le 1 - \mathbb{Q}\left(|Y_t^{*,\delta} - \mathbb{E}[Y_t^{*,\delta}]| \le \log|\epsilon| - |\mathbb{E}[Y_t^{*,\delta}]| \text{ for all } 0 \le t \le T\right)\end{aligned}$$

Here, take ϵ small enough, depending on T, z and u, such that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{Q}(\sup_{t\in[0,T]}|Y_t^{*,\delta}|>|\log\epsilon|) &\le 1-\mathbb{Q}\left(|Y_t^{*,\delta}-\mathbb{E}Y_t^{*,\delta}|\le\frac{\log|\epsilon|}{2}\ \text{ for all } 0\le t\le T\right)\\ &=\mathbb{Q}\left(\sup_{t\in[0,T]}|Y_t^{*,\delta}-\mathbb{E}Y_t^{*,\delta}|>\frac{\log|\epsilon|}{2}\right)\\ &\le\frac{\mathrm{Var}(Y_t^{*,\delta})}{(\frac{\log|\epsilon|}{2})^2},\end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from Doob–Kolmogorov inequality.

Last,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Var}(Y_t^{*,\delta}) &= \mathbb{E}\left(\int_0^t q^{*,\delta}\sqrt{Z_s}dW_s\right)^2\\ &=\int_0^t\mathbb{E}\left((q^{*,\delta})^2Z_s\right)ds && \text{(Itô isometry)}\\ &\le u^2C_1(T,z) && (d\le q^{*,\delta}\le u \text{ and equation (34)}).\end{aligned}$$

Finally, as $\epsilon\downarrow 0$, we can conclude that

$$\lim_{\epsilon\downarrow0}\mathbb{Q}(\tau^\epsilon<T)=0,$$

for any $T>0$, as desired.

Appendix D. Proof of (32). From (30) and (31), by decomposing in $\{\sup_{t\le s\le T}Z_s\le M\}$ and $\{\sup_{t\le s\le T}Z_s>M\}$ for any $M>z$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}\left[\int_t^{\tau^{-1}(T)}\mathbb{1}_{\{|B_v-x_i|<C\sqrt{\delta}\}}dv\right] &\le \mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}\left[\int_t^{Du^2T\sup_{t\le s\le T}Z_s}\mathbb{1}_{\{|B_v-x_i|<C\sqrt{\delta}\}}dv\right]\\ &\doteq \textcircled{1}+\textcircled{2}.\end{aligned}\tag{42}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\textcircled{1} &\le \mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}\left[\int_t^{Du^2TM}\mathbb{1}_{\{|B_v-x_i|<C\sqrt{\delta}\}}\mathbb{1}_{\{\sup_{t\le s\le T}Z_s\le M\}}dv\right]\\ &\le \mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}\left[\int_t^{Du^2TM}\mathbb{1}_{\{|B_v-x_i|<C\sqrt{\delta}\}}dv\right]\\ &= \int_t^{Du^2TM}\mathbb{Q}^B\{|B_v-x_i|<C\sqrt{\delta}\}dv\\ &\le \int_t^{Du^2TM}\frac{2C\sqrt{\delta}}{\sqrt{2\pi v}}dv\\ &\le \sqrt{\delta}(\frac{4C}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\sqrt{Du^2TM}).\end{aligned}\tag{43}$$

Let $\Gamma_s = \int_t^s \sqrt{\delta}\sqrt{Z_v} dW_v^Z$, and integrate the SDE of the process Z over $[t,s]$ for $s \in [t,T]$, we obtain

$$Z_s = z + \int_t^s \delta\kappa(\theta - Z_v)dv + \Gamma_s.$$

Since $Z_t \geq 0$ and $0 \leq \delta \leq 1$, we have

$$\sup_{t\leq s\leq T} Z_s \leq (z + \kappa\theta T) + \sup_{t\leq s\leq T} \Gamma_s, \tag{44}$$

and then let $M = z + \kappa\theta T + 1$, we have

$$\mathbb{1}_{\{\sup_{t\leq s\leq T} Z_s > M\}} \leq \mathbb{1}_{\{\sup_{t\leq s\leq T} \Gamma_s > 1\}}. \tag{45}$$

Therefore, by (44) and (45),

$$\begin{aligned}
\textcircled{2} \leq & \mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}\left[\int_t^{Cu^2T\sup_{t\leq s\leq T} Z_s} \mathbb{1}_{\{\sup_{t\leq s\leq T} Z_s > M\}} dv\right] \\
\leq & \mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\sup_{t\leq s\leq T} Z_s > M\}} Cu^2T \sup_{t\leq s\leq T} Z_s\right] \\
= & Cu^2T\mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\sup_{t\leq s\leq T} Z_s > M\}} \sup_{t\leq s\leq T} Z_s\right] \\
\leq & Cu^2T(\mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}\left[(z+\kappa\theta T)\mathbb{1}_{\{\sup_{t\leq s\leq T}\Gamma_s>1\}}\right] + \mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}\left[(\sup_{t\leq s\leq T}\Gamma_s)\mathbb{1}_{\{\sup_{t\leq s\leq T}\Gamma_s>1\}}\right]) \\
\doteq & Cu^2T(\textcircled{2.1} + \textcircled{2.2}).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that Γ_s is a martingale and thus Γ_s^2 is a nonnegative submartingale, thus by Doob's martingale inequality and since the process Z has finite moments uniformly in δ,

$$\textcircled{2.1} = (z + \kappa\theta T)\mathbb{Q}\{\sup_{t\leq s\leq T} \Gamma_s^2 > 1\} \leq (z + \kappa\theta T)\mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}[\Gamma_T^2] \leq L\delta, \tag{46}$$

where L may depend on z, κ, θ, T but not on δ.

Next, by the Doob's martingale inequality in L^2 form, we have

$$\textcircled{2.2} \leq \mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}\left[\sup_{t\leq s\leq T} \Gamma_s^2\right] \leq 2\mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}[\Gamma_T^2] \leq L'\delta. \tag{47}$$

Finally, by inequalities (32), (43), (46) and (47), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}\left[\int_t^T \mathbb{1}_{\{X_s^{*,\delta}\in A_{s,z}^{\delta}\}}\sigma^2(X_s^{*,\delta})ds\right]\\
\le&\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}\left[\int_t^T \mathbb{1}_{\{|X_s^{*,\delta}-x_i|<C\sqrt{\delta}\}}\sigma^2(X_s^{*,\delta})ds\right]\\
\le& n[\textcircled{1}+\textcircled{2.1}+\textcircled{2.2}]\\
\le& n[\sqrt{\delta}(\frac{4C}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\sqrt{Du^2TM})+L\delta+L'\delta]\\
\le& C_1\sqrt{\delta},
\end{aligned}$$

where C_1 a positive constant and does not depend on δ.

Appendix E. Proof of Uniform Boundedness of I_2 and I_3 on δ. With the help of Assumption 2.10, Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and the uniformly bounded moments of X_t and Z_t processes given in Appendix A, we are going to prove that I_2 and I_3 are uniformly bounded in δ.

First recall that

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 =&\mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}\left[\int_t^T\left(\rho(q^{*,\delta})Z_sX_s^{*,\delta}\partial^2_{xz}P_1(s,X_s^{*,\delta},Z_s)\right.\right.\\
&\left.\left.+\frac{1}{2}Z_s\partial^2_{zz}P_0(s,X_s^{*,\delta},Z_s)+\kappa(\theta-Z_s)\partial_zP_0(s,X_s^{*,\delta},Z_s)\right)ds\right],
\end{aligned}$$

and denote

$$I_2 \doteq I_2^{(1)}+I_2^{(2)}+I_2^{(3)},$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2^{(1)} \le&\mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)}\left[\int_t^T \rho u Z_sX_s^{*,\delta}|\partial^2_{xz}P_1(s,X_s^{*,\delta},Z_s)|ds\right]\\
\le&\rho u\mathbb{E}^{1/2}_{(t,x,z)}\left[\int_t^T\left(Z_sX_s^{*,\delta}\right)^2ds\right]\cdot\mathbb{E}^{1/2}_{(t,x,z)}\left[\int_t^T\left(\partial^2_{xz}P_1(s,X_s^{*,\delta},Z_s)\right)^2ds\right]\\
\le&\rho u\mathbb{E}^{1/4}_{(t,x,z)}\left[\int_t^T(Z_s)^4ds\right]\cdot\mathbb{E}^{1/4}_{(t,x,z)}\left[\int_t^T(X_s^{*,\delta})^4ds\right]\\
&\cdot\bar{a}_{11}^2\mathbb{E}^{1/2}_{(t,x,z)}\left[\int_t^T\left(1+|X_s^{*,\delta}|^{\bar{b}_{11}}+|Z_s|^{\bar{c}_{11}}\right)^2ds\right]\\
\le&\rho u\left(C_4(T,z)\right)^{1/4}\cdot\left(N_4(T,x,z)\right)^{1/4}\cdot\bar{A}_{11}[C_{2\bar{b}_{11}}(T,z)+N_{2\bar{c}_{11}}(T,x,z)]^{1/2},
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
I^{(3)} \le&\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}^{1/2}_{(t,x,z)}\left[\int_t^T(Z_s)^2ds\right]\cdot\mathbb{E}^{1/2}_{(t,x,z)}\left[\int_t^T\left(\partial^2_{zz}P_0(s,X_s^{*,\delta},Z_s)\right)^2ds\right]\\
\le&\frac{1}{2}\left(C_2(T,z)\right)^{1/2}\cdot A_{02}[C_{2b_{02}}(T,z)+N_{2c_{02}}(T,x,z)]^{1/2}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} I^{(4)} &\leq \kappa \mathbb{E}^{1/2}_{(t,x,z)} \left[\int_t^T (\theta - Z_s)^2 ds] \cdot \mathbb{E}^{1/2}_{(t,x,z)} [\int_t^T \left(\partial_z P_0(s, X_s^{*,\delta}, Z_s) \right)^2 ds \right] \\ &\leq \kappa \mathbb{E}^{1/2}_{(t,x,z)} \left[\int_t^T \theta^2 + Z_s^2 ds \right] \cdot \mathbb{E}^{1/2}_{(t,x,z)} \left[\int_t^T \left(\partial_z P_0(s, X_s^{*,\delta}, Z_s) \right)^2 ds \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(C_2(T,z) + \theta^2 (T-t) \right)^{1/2} \cdot A_{01} [C_{2b_{01}}(T,z) + N_{2c_{01}}(T,x,z)]^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{A}_{01}$, $\bar{A}_{11}$ and A_{02} are positive constants.

Next recall that

$$I_3 = \mathbb{E}_{(t,x,z)} \left[\int_t^T \frac{1}{2} Z_s \partial^2_{zz} P_1(s, X_s^{*,\delta}, Z_s) + \kappa(\theta - Z_s) \partial_z P_1(s, X_s^{*,\delta}, Z_s) ds \right],$$

and denote

$$I_3 \doteq I_3^{(1)} + I_3^{(2)}.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_3^{(1)} \leq & \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}^{1/2}_{(t,x,z)} \left[\int_t^T (Z_s)^2 ds \right] \cdot \mathbb{E}^{1/2}_{(t,x,z)} \left[\int_t^T \left(\partial^2_{zz} P_1(s, X_s^{*,\delta}, Z_s) \right)^2 ds \right] \\ \leq & (C_2(T,z))^{1/2} \cdot \bar{A}_{02} [C_{2\bar{b}_{02}}(T,z) + N_{2\bar{c}_{02}}(T,x,z)]^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} I_3^{(2)} &\leq 2\kappa \mathbb{E}^{1/2}_{(t,x,z)} \left[\int_t^T \theta^2 + Z_s^2 ds \right] \cdot \mathbb{E}^{1/2}_{(t,x,z)} \left[\int_t^T \left(\partial_z P_1(s, X_s^{*,\delta}, Z_s) \right)^2 ds \right] \\ &\leq 2\kappa [\theta^2 (T-t) + C_2(T,z)]^{1/2} \cdot \bar{A}_{01} [C_{2\bar{b}_{01}}(T,z) + N_{2\bar{c}_{01}}(T,x,z)]^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{A}_{01}$, $\bar{A}_{02}$ are positive constants.

REFERENCES

[1] L. Andersen and J. Andreasen, *Jump-diffusion processes: Volatility smile fitting and numerical methods for option pricing*, Review of Derivatives Research, 4 (2000), pp. 231–262.

[2] M. Avellaneda, A. Levy, and A. Parás, *Pricing and hedging derivative securities in markets with uncertain volatilities*, Applied Mathematical Finance, 2 (1995), pp. 73–88.

[3] F. Black and M. Scholes, *The pricing of options and corporate liabilities*, Journal of political economy, 81 (1973), pp. 637–654.

[4] M. G. Crandall, M. Kocan, and A. Świech, *Lp-theory for fully nonlinear uniformly parabolic equations: Parabolic equations*, Communications in Partial Differential Equations, 25 (2000), pp. 1997–2053.

[5] J.-P. Fouque, G. Papanicolaou, R. Sircar, and K. Sølna, *Multiscale stochastic volatility for equity, interest rate, and credit derivatives*, Cambridge University Press, 2011.

[6] J.-P. Fouque and B. Ren, *Approximation for option prices under uncertain volatility*, SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics, 5 (2014), pp. 360–383.

[7] A. Friedman, *Stochastic differential equations and applications. vol. 1. aca# demic press*, New York, (1975).
[8] M.-H. Giga, Y. Giga, and J. Saal, *Nonlinear partial differential equations: Asymptotic behavior of solutions and self-similar solutions*, vol. 79, Springer Science & Business Media, 2010.
[9] J. Guyon and P. Henry-Labordère, *Nonlinear option pricing*, CRC Press, 2013.
[10] S. L. Heston, *A closed-form solution for options with stochastic volatility with applications to bond and currency options*, Review of financial studies, 6 (1993), pp. 327–343.
[11] J. Hull and A. White, *The pricing of options on assets with stochastic volatilities*, The journal of finance, 42 (1987), pp. 281–300.
[12] K. In't Hout and S. Foulon, *Adi finite difference schemes for option pricing in the heston model with correlation*, International journal of numerical analysis and modeling, 7 (2010), pp. 303–320.
[13] I. Karatzas and S. Shreve, *Brownian motion and stochastic calculus*, vol. 113, Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
[14] N. V. Krylov, *Controlled diffusion processes*, vol. 14, Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
[15] T. Lepage, S. Lawi, P. Tupper, and D. Bryant, *Continuous and tractable models for the variation of evolutionary rates*, Mathematical biosciences, 199 (2006), pp. 216–233.
[16] T. J. Lyons, *Uncertain volatility and the risk-free synthesis of derivatives*, Applied mathematical finance, 2 (1995), pp. 117–133.
[17] R. C. Merton, *Option pricing when underlying stock returns are discontinuous*, Journal of financial economics, 3 (1976), pp. 125–144.
[18] G. Papanicolaou, J.-P. Fouque, K. Solna, and R. Sircar, *Singular perturbations in option pricing*, SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics, 63 (2003), pp. 1648–1665.
[19] H. Pham, *Continuous-time stochastic control and optimization with financial applications*, vol. 61, Springer Science & Business Media, 2009.
[20] D. W. Stroock and S. S. Varadhan, *Multidimensional diffusion processes*, Springer, 2007.
[21] L. Wang, *On the regularity theory of fully nonlinear parabolic equations: I*, Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics, 45 (1992), pp. 27–76.
[22] L. Wang, *On the regularity theory of fully nonlinear parabolic equations: Ii*, Communications on pure and applied mathematics, 45 (1992), pp. 141–178.